

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending.

Objection to Abstract

Applicants have deleted the Abstract and replaced it with the Abstract attached hereto. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that this objection should be withdrawn.

Arrangement of the Specification

Applicants note that the suggested headings are for the most part optional and not mandatory. However, Applicants have amended the specification to include at least some of these headings. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in compliance with the requirements of the Office.

Specification Objections

With respect to the specification objections at page 7, the reference labels for the air-rich oxidant stream and the hydrocarbon-rich stream are correct on page 7, but are incorrect on page 3. Consequently, Applicants have amended paragraphs a) and c) on page 3 to correct these clerical errors, as well as in claim 1. These errors are readily apparent by referring to the last paragraph on page 8. With respect to the partial oxidation chamber, Applicants have amended the specification to indicate that the chamber 3 is upstream of the exchanger 5. This relationship is correct with respect to the effluent leaving the chamber 3. Due to the exchanger 5 being a feed/effluent exchanger, it should be noted that the oxidation chamber 3 could also be considered downstream of the exchanger 5 with respect to the feed via line 40.

With respect to the objections at pages 8 and 10, Applicants have made suitable corrections.

Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that these objections be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Applicants have amended claims to remove these objections. With respect to the amendment to claim 12, Applicants have amended claim 12 to define a device for producing electricity by the process according to claim 1. Consequently, Applicants submit that these claim objections should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1, 4, 6, and 18 are cited for allegedly being indefinite. Applicants have amended these claims to remove these rejections. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections should be withdrawn.


With respect to the rejection pertaining to the dwell time in the chamber, the action states that it is unclear how to measure dwell time in a continuous flow chamber. However, Applicants respectfully submit that one of skill in the art would understand how to calculate a dwell time by dividing the volume of the chamber by the volumetric flow rate of the incoming feed. (If the Examiner desires, the conventional synonymous chemical engineering term "residence time" can be substituted for "dwell time" throughout the disclosure.)

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the claim amendments discussed above and others conform the claims to typical prosecution practice or make explicit what is inherent, and thus do not narrow the scope of the claims.

In view of the above remarks, favorable reconsideration is courteously requested. If there are any remaining issues which can be expedited by a telephone conference, the Examiner is courteously invited to telephone counsel at the number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,



James E. Ruland, Reg. No. 37,432

I. William Millen, Reg. No. 19,544

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C.

Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400

2200 Clarendon Boulevard

Arlington, Virginia 22201

Telephone: (703) 243-6333

Facsimile: (703) 243-6410

Attorney Docket No.: PET-1986

Date: May 10, 2004